### Remarks

Reconsideration is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. In the Office action mailed January 29, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-30 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0015783 to Lennon et al. (hereinafter "Lennon") under § 102(e), and additionally rejected claims 1-12 under § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 13, and 23 are independent, and claims 2-12, 14-22, and 24-30 are dependent. Applicants respectfully traverse.

## Claim Rejections Under § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 under § 101 as directed to non-statutory matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended to claim "A tangible computer readable storage media having encoded thereon a data structure representing a visual style, capable of being read and applied by a computer to one or more object instances of a lookless user interface element for rendering the user interface element according to the visual style. . . ." This amendment finds support throughout the specification. Claim 1 is now limited to only "tangible computer readable storage media." It is further directed to a functional data structure "representing a visual style" that may be read and used by a computer "for rendering the user interface element according to the visual style." This is more than a "mere arrangement of data" that otherwise has no useful purpose. Accordingly, claim 1 as amended claims subject matter within the scope of § 101, and should now be allowable. Likewise, claims 2-12 depend from claim 1, and should be allowable in light of the amendment to claim 1.

### Claim Rejections Under § 102(e)

### Lennon

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-30 as anticipated by Lennon. In order to reach a shared understanding of the disclosures of Lennon, Applicants make the following observations:

Lennon is directed to methods for querying and creating user-defined views of data derived from multiple heterogeneous sources. (Lennon at Abstract.) Lennon describes a data browsing application through which users can "create personalised views of data over data sources that are of interest to them." (Lennon at ¶ 0133.) These views typically use one or more mappings, which "serve[] to map data from the data sources of interest into a form desired by the user in a data view." (Id.) Furthermore, personalized data views may be created by a user by "interact[ing] with the schemas (or data dictionaries) of the data sources of interest. These schemas show[] the classes of data contained within data sources of interest and the relationships between the data." (Lennon at ¶ 0141.) Lennon thus describes a system for pulling data from a number of heterogeneous data sources and presenting it in a new and useful fashion.

# II. Independent Claims 1, 13, and 23 are Allowable

With these observations in mind, each of claims 1, 13, and 23 are patentable over Lennon. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

one or more bindings between visual properties of the user interface element and corresponding properties of its sub-elements, wherein the sub-elements consume values associated with bound properties of the user interface element for rendering the user interface element according to the visual style, and changing the value associated with a bound property effects a change in the visual appearance of the consuming sub-element.

## Claim 13, as amended, recites:

... selectively binding visual properties of the sub-elements to consume corresponding properties of the user interface element for rendering the user interface element according to the determined visual style, where each bound visual property has an associated value which is used to set the visual appearance of the consuming sub-element of the user interface element.

## Claim 23, as amended, recites:

a user interface element factory for creating instances of sub-elements for composing the user interface element according to the selected visual style document for rendering, where each sub-element consumes a value in the selected visual style document which determines the visual appearance of the consuming sub-element of the user interface element.

Lennon fails to teach or disclose at least one element in each of the above-quoted sections for at least the following reasons:

Lennon describes a user selecting data sources via the data browser, which then searches for XML schema definitions corresponding to each selected data source. (Lennon at ¶ 0144.) Upon locating the definition, the browser recursively locates definitions for any child elements that are defined, and then presents the located definitions in a tree structure, which forms an initial schema view. (Lennon at ¶ 0145.) "A schema view shows the classes of data contained

within the data sources and relationships between the data. Unlike a data view, a schema view does not contain instance data." (Lennon at ¶0142.) Essentially, a schema view is a tree view of selected data sources, where the appearance of the tree view is ultimately dictated by the sources initially selected by the user, and the recursively located definitions.

As each schema merely recites the structure of its associated data source, how the schema view is ultimately represented is dependent on how the data browser is setup, and how the data source itself was initially structured. Importantly, Lennon does not disclose the structure of data sources (and their corresponding representation in the schema view) being altered by the data browser, or child data sources referenced in the initial schema definitions for the selected data sources being altered by any values in the parent schema definitions. Moreover, the visual appearance of the views presented by the data browser are handled at a GUI level by the user. "[T]he user can modify presentation properties (e.g. Fonts, styles, colours, etc.), apply filters, change the sort order, specify and apply transformations that may apply to one or more data components, etc." (Lennon at ¶ 0239.) Accordingly, Lennon is different than, and in fact teaches away from:

"where each bound visual property has an associated value which is used to set the visual appearance of the consuming sub-element of the user interface element" (as in claim 1),

"where each bound visual property has an associated value which is used to set the visual appearance of the consuming sub-element of the user interface element" (as in claim 13), and

"where each sub-element consumes a value in the selected visual style document which determines the visual appearance of the consuming sub-element of the user interface element" (as in claim 23).

Accordingly Lennon fails to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted language of claims 1, 13, and 23, respectively. Claims 1, 13, and 23 are allowable.

## III. Dependent Claims 2-12, 14-22, and 24-30 are Allowable

Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1. Claims 14-22 depend from claim 13. Claims 24-30 depend from claim 23. Dependent claims 2-12, 14-22 and 24-30 should be allowable. In view of the foregoing discussion of independent claims 1, 13, and 23, the Applicant will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of the dependent claims.

Page 9 of 10

### Request for Interview

If any issues remain, the Examiner is formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney prior to issuance of the next Office Action in order to arrange a telephonic interview. It is believed that a brief discussion of the merits of the present application may expedite prosecution. Applicant submits the foregoing formal Amendment so that the Examiner may fully evaluate Applicant's position, thereby enabling the interview to be more focused.

This request is being submitted under MPEP § 713.01, which indicates that an interview may be arranged in advance by a written request.

## Conclusion

All claims should now be in good condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600 121 S.W. Salmon Street

Portland, Oregon 97204 Telephone: (503) 595-5300 Facsimile: (503) 595-5301 By /Jonathan M. Ward/ Jonathan M. Ward Registration No. 56,466